

DANA A. SUNTAG (State Bar #125127)
JOSHUA J. STEVENS (State Bar # 238105)
HERUM\CRABTREE\SUNTAG
A California Professional Corporation
5757 Pacific Avenue, Suite 222
Stockton, California 95207
Telephone: (209) 472-7700
dsuntag@herumcrabtree.com
jstevens@herumcrabtree.com

Attorneys for All Defendants

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11	JAMES WEAVER, JR., et al.,)	Case No. 2:20-CV-00990-JAM-JDP
12	Plaintiffs,)	STIPULATION TO EXTEND
13	vs.)	DEFENDANTS' DEADLINE TO:
14	CITY OF STOCKTON, et al.,)	(i) FILE REPLY ON MSJ; AND
15	Defendants.)	(ii) FILE OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'
16)	COUNTERMOTION;
17)	ORDER
18)	Date: May 31, 2022
19)	Time: 1:30 p.m.
20)	Courtroom: 6
21)	Judge: Hon. John A. Mendez

1 This Stipulation is entered into all parties, through their counsel of record.

2 RECITALS

3 A. On April 1, 2022, all Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment, or,
4 alternatively, partial summary judgment (the “MSJ”), set for hearing, per the Court’s Scheduling
5 Order, on May 17, 2022.

6 B. Pursuant to Rules 230(c) and (e) of the Local Rules, amended effective March 1,
7 2022, Plaintiffs’ Opposition to the MSJ and any countermotion were due by April 15, 2022.

8 C. On May 2, 2022, Plaintiffs filed their Opposition to the MSJ and a Countermotion
9 to exclude certain testimony. Plaintiffs also filed an Ex Parte Application asking the Court to
10 excuse the late filing of their Opposition to the MSJ (which they erroneously labeled as an “Ex
11 Parte Application to Strike Defendants’ Reply for Being Untimely”).

12 D. On May 3, 2022, the Court sua sponte issued a minute order continuing the
13 hearings on the MSJ and Plaintiffs’ Ex Parte Application to May 31, 2022.

14 E. On May 4, 2022, Plaintiffs filed a Request for Judicial Notice in further
15 opposition to the MSJ.

16 F. Pursuant to Local Rule 230(c), Defendants’ Reply on the MSJ is due on May 12,
17 2022, and pursuant to Rule 230(e), Defendants’ Opposition to the Countermotion is due on
18 May 16, 2022.

19 G. Because of the additional time Plaintiffs had before filing their Reply on the MSJ
20 and their Countermotion, counsel for Defendants asked counsel for Plaintiffs if she would
21 stipulate that Defendants can have additional time to file both their Reply on the MSJ and their
22 Opposition to the Countermotion up to May 17, 2022, which is 14 days before the May 31, 2022,
23 hearing, which would have the effect of granting Defendants an extra five days to file their Reply
24 on the MSJ and an extra one day to file their Opposition to the Countermotion.

25 H. Plaintiffs’ counsel consented to Defendants’ request for additional time.
26
27
28

STIPULATION

IT IS STIPULATED AND AGREED, by the parties, through their counsel of record, as follows:

1. Defendants have a five day extension of time, through and including May 17, 2022, to file their Reply on the MSJ; and

2. Defendants have a one day extension of time, through and including May 17, 2022, to file their Opposition to the Countermotion.

Dated: May 6, 2022

HERUM/CRABTREE/SUNTAG
A California Professional Corporation

By: /s/ Joshua J. Stevens
JOSHUA J. STEVENS
Attorneys for All Defendants

Dated: May 6, 2022

LAW OFFICES OF YOLANDA HUANG

By: /s/ Yolanda Huang
YOLANDA HUANG
Attorneys for All Plaintiffs

ORDER

The Court has reviewed and considered the parties' Stipulation. Good cause appearing therefor, IT IS ORDERED that the relief requested in the Stipulation is GRANTED, as follows:

1. Defendants have a five-day extension of time, through and including May 17, 2022, to file their Reply on the MSJ; and

2. Defendants have a one-day extension of time, through and including May 17, 2022, to file their Opposition to the Countermotion.

Dated: May 6, 2022

/s/ John A. Mendez
THE HONORABLE JOHN A. MENDEZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE